

# Minutes

# City of Loma Linda

*Department of Community Development*

## Planning Commission

Chair Rosenbaum called a regular meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:05 p.m., **Wednesday, October 6, 2004**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

**Commissioners Present:** Mary Lee Rosenbaum, Chair  
Randy Neff, Vice Chair  
Michael Christianson  
Rene Sakala  
Charles Umeda

**Staff Present:** Richard Holdaway, City Attorney  
Deborah Woldruff, Director, Community Development  
Lori Lamson, Senior Planner  
Raul Colunga, Assistant Planner  
Jeff Peterson, Associate Engineer, Public Works Department  
Jocelyne Larabie, Administrative Secretary

### **ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED**

There were no items to be added or deleted.

### **ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

Ms. Sandra Stephenson, 26245 Avenida Requero addressed the Commission to inquire about the disposition of the Mission School. Director Woldruff replied that there were no plans to remove or demolish the building at this time or in the near future but that the City of Loma Linda would like to conserve the Mission School for active reuse. Ms. Stephenson thanked the Commission and staff for their information.

### **CONTINUED ITEMS**

#### **PUBLIC HEARING**

#### **CONTINUED ITEMS**

**PC-04-50 - ZONE CHANGE (ZC) NO. 03-03, TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TT 03-03) NO. 16650, PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN (PPD) NO. 04-07 - A request to change the zoning map from Agricultural (A-1) to Single Family Residence (R-1); to subdivide 9.1 acres into 36 residential lots; and, to construct 36 single family homes on the site located on the south east corner of Bryn Mawr Avenue at George Street.**

Assistant Planner Colunga reported that the item had been continued item from the September 1, 2004 Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Colunga reported that the applicant, Trimark Pacific Homes L.P., was requesting approval of a Zone change from Agricultural (A-1) to Single Family Residence (R-1), and Tract Map TTM No. 16650 to subdivide the property into 36 lots with lot sizes in excess of 7,200 square feet.

He continued to say that the Precise Plan of Design (PPD) No. 04-07 focused on the site layout and the residential design and landscaping. The characteristics are as follows:

- The density of 4 du/ac falls within the Low Density designation of 2.1 to 5 du/ac.;
- The applicant provided a more curved appearance for Street B in the redesign;
- The cul-de-sac design and the wall along Bryn Mawr Avenue were not changed and the applicant's Engineer can address the reasons behind the decision;
- The site plan shows two new 36-foot wide streets (60 ft ROW) with access off of George Street;
- No common area or park space proposed;

- A Landscape Maintenance District (LMD) proposed along the project boundary. Condition 1.28 has been added to require the applicant to provide minimum 36-inch box size trees in the LMD areas to provide a more mature look;
- The site plan redesigned to include a parkway;
- Vinyl fencing between the homes and a perimeter block wall along George Street and Bryn Mawr Avenue. Condition 1.33 has been added to require this modification;
- There are three plans, two two-story models, and because a single-story design would take up a bigger footprint and cut into the amount of useable outdoor space, the applicant opted for a story and a half design of approximately 3,200 square feet in modern adaptations of Cottage and Traditional designs.

Mr. Colunga continued to say that the applicant was proposing four Plan 1 designs, which offered up to four bedrooms, a two-car garage, and a 9-foot deep front porch. He added that staff was pleased with the new design but felt that the design could be further improved. Staff suggested reorienting the front door for better access to the front porch, recessing the garage two to three feet, and enlarging bedroom two to a minimum dimension of 12 feet by 10 feet. Mr. Colunga stated that should the Planning Commission find the design appropriate Condition 1.27 had been provided to address the modifications.

Mr. Colunga described the changes to Plan 2 as a redesign with a courtyard to address concerns regarding the recessed front door entry and added that should the Planning Commission find the design appropriate, Condition 1.41 would require the courtyard area and landscaping. He continued to say that the applicant addressed Condition 1.20 by adding the wood siding on the front elevation of the side-loaded garage.

Mr. Colunga pointed out that Plan 3B showed the second story front balcony and the five-foot offset from the property line, which was required. He added that the applicant had addressed blank exterior walls by providing a window in the garage on the Plan 2 and 3 models and the addition of a small window to the sidewall of the kitchen without compromising cabinet space.

Mr. Colunga stated that staff provided findings for Zone Change No. 03-03, Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 16650, and Precise Plan of Design (PPD) No. 04-07 and because of the design changes and the modified Conditions of Approval, staff recommended approval of the above referenced project.

A discussion regarding the project ensued and covered the following subjects:

- Spanish style plan – changing the square windows for arched ones to exemplify the true Spanish style and arched elements over the entry door and arched windows at the ground level;
- Backyard and trash receptacle access – Access illustrated on the side of the house on the site plans;
- Cul-de-sac streets – Because of grade separation, it was not possible to connect the streets without large retaining walls higher than the 6-foot maximum stated in the Loma Linda Municipal Code;
- The addition of architectural details for Plan 1DR and Plan 1C – It was the consensus that a second dormer be added for Plans 1C and 1DR;

At the conclusion of the discussion there was a consensus of the Planning Commission on the following:

- For Plan 2AR:
  - Arched windows on the first floor with decorative corbel over the entry door
  - Hand-trowel stucco finish – smoother sand finish as opposed to a knock-down finish;
  - Three roof vents to be placed closer together;
- For Plan 3AR:
  - Garage doors to match the architectural style of the house;
  - Match front doors to the style of the house and the garage door.

Commissioner Umeda asked if it would be possible for the applicant to increase the number of 1½-story models to 20% of the proposed number of homes. Mr. Anderly informed the Commission that it might be possible to plan two additional Plan 1 models, hopefully one on each of the streets, but would need to verify with staff that all setbacks requirements were respected.

The discussion continued on the subject of the two cul-de-sac streets planned for the project. Director Woldruff explained that staff had looked at several designs for the neighborhood and because of the size, shape and topography of the site, the design of the proposed project was

the best alternative for the area. She added that on the issue of the perimeter wall, as discussed earlier, if a wall was not built, the residents of the tract would be looking at the block wall for the existing neighborhood.

Chair Rosenbaum wanted to clarify that a walkway from sidewalk to front door was a standard condition and Ms. Lamson explained that it was a Condition of Approval and would be required. Derek Hanson, TriMark Homes, explained that it was an oversight and that the problem would be addressed on the working plans.

#### Conditions of Approval

Senior Planner Lamson informed the Commission that there were 10 new conditions of approval to add to the submitted form. Mr. Colunga added that he had provided an updated copy of the Conditions of Approval to correct errors and redundancies.

Ms. Lamson listed the new conditions:

1. The front doors shall be increased and/or a sidelight to the side entry to be added on Plan 2;
2. Another dormer shall be added above the garage to provide a window in the loft area of the 1½-story Plan 1;
3. A smooth hand trowel stucco finish shall be applied to all Spanish styles;
4. The Plan 2AR shall have two front windows that are arched;
5. Garage doors would be provided that were more in keeping the carriage door style. Review and approval shall be required by the Community Development Department;
6. The "S" tile on the Spanish style shall be a large "S" tile;
7. The Cottage style tile shall be offset with a staggered ½ -inch offset;
8. The three decorative clay pipe vent shall be placed closer together to appear more authentic;
9. Two additional Plan 1 models shall be incorporated into the project and preferably one on each street;
10. The front doors shall match the style of architecture of each home and review and approval shall be required by the Community Development Department.

#### Condition 1.47

Chair Rosenbaum asked if the insulation for the south and west walls could be increased to help with the comfort level inside the house. Derek Hanson from TriMark Homes explained that they had Title 24 consultants use a worse case scenario to determine the necessary amount of insulation factors.

**Motion by Neff, seconded by Umeda, and unanimously carried to Approve and Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program; Approve and Adopt Zone Change No. 03-03, based on the Findings; Approve Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 16650 based on the Findings, and subject to the Conditions of Approval; and Approve Precise Plan of Design (PPD) No. 04-07, based on the findings and subject to the amended Conditions of Approval.**

**PC-04-51 - GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA) NO. 03-002, ZONE CHANGE (ZC) NO. 03-002, TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TTM) NO. 15738, PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN (PPD) NO. 04-08 AND A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT- A request to change the General Plan Land Use Plan and Zoning Maps from Low Density Residential and Single-Family Residence (R-1) to Medium High Density Residential and Planned Community (PC) to accommodate the subdivision of 2.46 acres into 27 residential lots with 5 lettered lots. The project also requests approval for the site design and housing products, and Development Agreement to address the Redevelopment Agency's affordable housing requirements. The project site is located in the North Central Neighborhood and is bounded by Lilac Street on the north, State Street on the east, Lane Street on the south, and San Timoteo Creek channel on the west.**

Commissioner Christianson stated that because he owned property within the 500' radius of the project, he would recuse himself to avoid a possible conflict of interest.

Senior Planner Lamson presented the staff report and explained that the project required a General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, and Tract Map in order to subdivide 2.46 acres into 27 attached and detached residential units. She added that the design of the housing, the landscaping and the site design would also be addressed at this time, through a Precise Plan of

Design and that a Development Agreement was necessary requiring the applicant to build and pay an in-lieu fee to meet affordable housing regulations.

Ms. Lamson explained that the project site was located in the North Central Neighborhood and that the surrounding land uses were a mix of single-family and multi-family residential uses. She listed the project's characteristics:

- Gross density of 11 du/acre;
- Average lot size of approximately 2500 sf;
- Five access points into private drives;
- Street are a standard width of 36 feet;
- Eight off-street parking spaces;
- Three small public parks along Lane and Lilac Streets, one with a tot lot;
- Picnic tables and passive space in the remaining two parks;
- Homeowners' Association to maintain parks and open space.

She added the following information about the product:

- Three housing plans;
- Twenty-two attached units in clusters of two to four units;
- Five detached units;
- The plans included two and three bedrooms two-story building with front porches and balconies;
- Plan A – 1,150 sf;
- Plan B – 1,300 sf;
- Plan C – 1,500 sf;
- Garages behind the houses.

She continued to describe the design of the houses:

- One architectural style to provide an attractive and unified design;
- Stucco wall proposed in six different colors;
- Six accent colors for wood accents and doors;
- Composition roof material in six different color schemes;
- Color palette in warm earth tones.

Ms. Lamson explained that the developer would be required to landscape the front yard, parkways, and exterior side yards, and rear yard areas outside the private yards. She added that all lettered lots, which include common areas, parks, and open space would also be landscaped by the developer and maintained by the HOA.

Ms. Lamson reported that the Community Development Department had received several letters of concern petitions in opposition to this project. Copies had been provided to the Planning Commission. She listed the concerns as follows:

- The increase in population and housing density;
- The construction of affordable housing;
- The connection of Lane and Lilac Streets;
- The use of the property as a park site;
- Flood issues; and,
- The proximity of proposed two-story units to existing one-story single-family residences.

Ms. Lamson stated that the proposed subdivision and Precise Plan of Design were consistent with the proposed land use designations and met the City's goal and policy to provide residents with a variety of housing opportunities. She added that approval of the Development Agreement would enable the project to comply with the City's affordable housing requirements. She continued to say that Findings to approve the subdivision had been provided and that if the Planning Commission felt comfortable reviewing the side and rear elevations, Staff had prepared findings to approve the Precise Plan of Design. She added that if the Commission would prefer additional time to review the side and rear elevations, the PPD portion of the project could be continued to the meeting on November 3, 2004.

Ms. Lamson explained that to ensure that the front elevations of the units integrate with the street frontages, Lot 9 should not be plotted with a reverse plan. The unit should be oriented so that the front porch is located on the Lane Street frontage. She added that Condition No. 1.11 included this requirement.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the public comment period at 8:20 p.m.

Hazel Robinson, 10761 Coloma Street, Loma Linda, stated that she opposed the project and made the following comments:

- Loma Linda was a nice town 20 years ago;
- The City does not have the services for an increase of population;
- The neighborhood was a safe one.

Barry O'Connor, 10782 Jasmine Street, Loma Linda was opposed for the following reasons:

- Density was too high;
- Increase in traffic;
- The houses had no variety, they all looked the same;
- It would be an invasion of privacy because of the houses were two-story;
- He was worried about the light pollution issue.

Carl Salhin, 25380 State Street, #A, Loma Linda made the following comments:

- Traffic issues would impede travel especially at Redlands Boulevard;
- Appealed to the Planning Commission to reject the project;
- The project's only purpose was to satisfy the greed of Orange County developers.

Sherman Jefferson, 25351 Mead Street, Loma Linda offered the following comments:

- Houses were too close to the fence;
- Works at Medical Center;
- He bought a home in Loma Linda because it was a small and safe community;
- He does not approve of the project.

Howard Jewell, 11490 Iris Street, Loma Linda commented:

- Trees and Landscape would block view because Lane Street is curved;
- Low-income housing would cause problems.

Tom Ingalls, 25448 Lane Street, Loma Linda, stated that many changes should be brought to this project and it should be reviewed.

Tanya Tolson, 25400 State Street, Loma Linda, made the following comments:

- The children who live on State street play in the vacant lot, so they would lose a safe area to play;
- Need better parks for young and old alike;
- There was nowhere that visitors could park;
- There was no room for emergency services, and trash and maintenance trucks to maneuver;
- Low-income housing would extend gang territory;
- Issues of animal control.

Debbie Ingalls, 25448 Lane Street, Loma Linda, stated:

- Density too high;
- Remove some of the houses, Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 25, 26 and 27, and replace them with amenities;
- Fewer homes would decrease traffic;
- Ms. Ingalls suggested that the Planning Commission rethink the project and the impacts that it would have on existing homes.

Eugene Robinson, 10761 Coloma Street, Loma Linda spoke to flood insurance issues and the threat of the West Nile Virus in the standing water in the creek and added that in his opinion townhouses for low-income wage earners would bring undesirable people to live in the neighborhood. He had questions on other issues not on the agenda. Director Woldruff asked Mr. Robinson to submit his questions and she would be happy to address them for him.

Cindy Chrisler, 25594 Lane Street, Loma Linda, listed the following concerns:

- Issues of graffiti on Lilac, Park, and Cottage streets and if the streets are open the problems would be worse;
- Wanted Zoning to be retained as R-1 & R-2;
- Lane Street was a blind curve and opening the street would cause safety issues;
- Project was inconsistent;
- Retain the cul-de-sacs;
- Project would increase in traffic;
- Not enough parking for all the new properties;
- Considered that Loma Linda was subsidizing low-income housing.

Sam Strade, 10740 Lilac Avenue, Loma Linda, stated that he had to put up a wrought iron fence around his property because of the increase in crimes in the area and that he was also concerned about the increase in traffic with the new project.

The public comment period was closed at 8:55 p.m.

Mohammed Younes, PBS & J Engineering, 3610 Central Avenue, Ste 500, Riverside CA, Civil Engineer for the project representing Sal Gottuso and Associates thanked staff for their assistance in putting the project together and responded to residents' concerns. He stated that the project complied with the Draft General Plan in regards to the change in density for the area to Medium Density.

- Applicant provided a very good traffic study that addressed the issues of the increase in traffic and circulation for this project with mitigation measures and Conditions of Approval to address the issue;
- On the parks issue, the applicant would contribute and pay fees as well as provide two small local parks for the new community;
- To address the blind curve, the speed limit would be set at 25 mph and the existing curve on the street would meet the safety requirement;
- In the case of the high density of the project, the City is in need of affordable housing to meet State mandate requirements.

Commissioner Rosenbaum pointed out that the quality architecture appeared to be rather plain and wanted to know what the objective was when designing the buildings. Mr. Younes explained that he thought that the project had been designed to ensure that it could still provide affordable housing and maintain the cost of the house reasonable for first-time homebuyers.

Commissioners Umeda and Neff requested clarification regarding the density of the project because it did not seem to fit either the existing General Plan or the Draft General Plan. Ms. Lamson explained that during the discussion of the Draft General Plan that the area could be increased to Medium-High density and because the applicant was requesting to increase the density, and was being brought before the Planning Commission as a request for a General Plan Amendment.

The public comment period was re-opened at 9:03 p.m.

Mr. Sam Strade, 10740 Lilac Street, Loma Linda again addressed the Commission to state that the project on Mission Road had been required to provide some amenities and wanted to know why amenities could not be planned for the south side of Barton Road in the south hills. Chair Rosenbaum replied that the property was mostly privately owned and that the City of Loma Linda did not have the funds to provide those amenities.

Debbie Ingalls, 25448 Lane Street, Loma Linda, commented on the issue of a possible traffic light being added at Mountain View Avenue and Lane Street, and at Redlands Boulevard and Poplar Street adding that it did not make sense to have two traffic lights so close together.

Dean Hagley, 25513 Lane Street, Loma Linda, commented that the mailboxes for the residents were on the other side of the street and if the project was approved as it was presented, they would have to cross the street to get their mail and he was concerned with the safety of the people.

Cindy Chrisler, 25594 Lane Street, Loma Linda, commented that this project would have to be built adjacent to a single-family home area to get to another area of high-density housing.

Tom Tolson, 25400 State Street, Loma Linda, invited the Planning Commission to take a tour of the neighborhood to see what the new project would bring as far as density. He added that if the project was allowed to go ahead, the neighborhood would have a dramatic increase in crime.

Jim Lewis, 25361 Mead Street, Loma Linda, stated that he bought the property because it was a small neighborhood and he felt that the City was taking away their land and that he didn't like it.

The public comment period was close at 9:10 p.m.

Commissioner Umeda thanked the residents of the North Central Neighborhood for attending the meeting and for providing the Planning Commission with their comments. He continued to say that he found that the density for the project was too high for 27 houses on 2.46 acres. Mr. Umeda commented that to develop that piece of property it would seem that Lane Street would need to be connected to Lilac Street.

Commissioner Sakala commented that the project did not fit in with the existing neighborhood and that her suggestions were to lower the density, make the all home detached and provide better quality architecture.

Commissioner Neff stated that he did not agree with the high density and was also concerned about the increase in traffic. He added that he opposed the development and added that the applicant should revise the project to better address the concerns of the residents and to design a more appropriate project.

Commissioner Umeda suggested that the applicant be given direction to include the suggested changes and to show respect for the existing neighborhood by designing a project that would consist of single-story houses that would provide for a much lower density.

Chair Rosenbaum summarized the Commission's concerns. She stated that the Planning Commission had reached a consensus on lowering the density of the project so that it resembled the existing neighborhood, and the other issue concerned the street closure. A discussion ensued. Associate Engineer Peterson stated that opening the street would improve circulation and shorten response times for emergency vehicles. He added that State Street was not part of the project and it would not be appropriate for the applicant to make State Street a cul-de-sac, as he would have to go onto private property.

The discussion concluded and Commissioner Umeda suggested that the Commission approach the Redevelopment Agency to discuss all the issues brought out during the meeting.

**Motion by Umeda, seconded by Neff, and carried by a vote of 4-0 to continue the project to the Regular Meeting of November 3, 2004 to allow the Planning Commission additional time to study the project and to approach the Redevelopment Agency Chairman to the discuss the property and to allow the applicant to revise the project to include the suggested changes.**

Commissioner Christianson returned to the meeting

**PC-04-52 - GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA) NO. 04-03, ZONE CHANGE (ZC) NO. 04-03, TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TTM) NO. 16811, AND PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN (PPD) NO. 04-04 AND A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT (ROGER PORTER)- A proposal to change the General Plan Land Use Plan and Zoning Maps from Professional Office and Administrative Professional to Mixed-Use and Planned Community to accommodate a 30-lot subdivision on approximately 3.0 acres of land located at the southwest corner of Orange Avenue and New Jersey Street. The project includes requests for approval of the proposed site design and housing products, and a Development Agreement to address the Redevelopment Agency's affordable housing requirements.**

Assistant Planner Colunga presented the staff report. He explained that the applicants, Roger Peter Porter and Terry Smith were proposing the Mission Grove development on the southwest corner of Orange Avenue at New Jersey Street, which is located in the Historic Mission Overlay District.

Assistant Planner Colunga reported that the applicants, Mr. Roger Peter Porter and Mr. Terry Smith proposed to develop the approximately 3.0 acre property on the southwest corner of Orange Avenue at New Jersey Street located in the Historic Mission Overlay District. He added that the site was mostly vacant with the exception of a vacated 1950's single-family residence at 26657 Orange Avenue, which would require demolition. Mr. Colunga explained that the issue of the demolition went before the Historical Commission on August 2, 2004, which recommended that a Certificate of Appropriateness not be approved by the City Council because they felt that the project was too dense and did not comply with the Historic Mission Overlay District. He added that the Archaeological Report by CRM TECH indicated that neither the Orange Avenue residence nor the accessory structure were historically significant. Mr. Colunga stated that the most prominent feature of the site was a row of California Fan Palms located along New Jersey Street, and these would be incorporated into the project development.

Mr. Colunga explained that the applicants requested a General Plan Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment from Professional Office and Administrative Professional to Mixed-Use and Planned Community to allow for a variety of uses such as residential, commercial, institutional and light industrial and designation was also intended to provide some flexibility of land use to meet market demands. He added that a Planned Community Document was required to determine site-specific development standards. He continued to say that an Economic

Feasibility Studies had been prepared for this project and other projects in the surrounding area indicated that professional and administrative office uses and industrial uses were not likely to be attracted to the site. Therefore, it appeared that a residential use would be more appropriate on the subject property.

Assistant Planner Colunga reported that the applicants, Mr. Roger Peter Porter and Mr. Terry Smith proposed to develop the approximately 3.0 acre property on the southwest corner of Orange Avenue at New Jersey Street located in the Historic Mission Overlay District. He added that the site was mostly vacant with the exception of a vacated 1950's single-family residence at 26657 Orange Avenue, which would require demolition. Mr. Colunga explained that the issue of the demolition went before the Historical Commission on August 2, 2004, which recommended that a Certificate of Appropriateness not be approved by the City Council because they felt that the project was too dense and did not comply with the Historic Mission Overlay District. He added that the Archaeological Report by CRM TECH indicated that neither the Orange Avenue residence nor the accessory structure were historically significant. Mr. Colunga stated that the most prominent feature of the site was a row of California Fan Palms located along New Jersey Street, and these would be incorporated into the project development.

Mr. Colunga explained that the applicants requested a General Plan Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment from Professional Office and Administrative Professional to Mixed-Use and Planned Community to allow for a variety of uses such as residential, commercial, institutional and light industrial and designation was also intended to provide some flexibility of land use to meet market demands. He added that a Planned Community Document was required to determine site-specific development standards. He continued to say that an Economic Feasibility Studies had been prepared for this project and other projects in the surrounding area indicated that professional and administrative office uses and industrial uses were not likely to be attracted to the site. Therefore, it appeared that a residential use would be more appropriate on the subject property.

Mr. Colunga described Tentative Tract Map 16811 as follows:

- A subdivision of a 3.0-acre property into 30 single-family lots;
- Density of 10.94 du/ac, which was below the density proposed in the Draft General Plan;
- Average lot size of 2,420 square feet - Lots range from 2,400 to 6,700 square feet;
- Private community with three new streets - Lot size and setbacks included in the PC document;
- Street A and C with street width of 28 feet. No parking allowed on Street B where the street width is 25 feet;
- A crash gate is proposed at the north end of Street B, as well as a vehicle turnaround; Public Safety has reviewed the project and provided additional comments to compensate for the narrower streets and alley;
- Twelve guest parking spaces are provided along Street A;
- The project will have a 9,000 square foot park with Amenities that include benches, picnic tables, BBQ's and playground equipment.

Mr. Colunga stated that the project requested approval for the housing design:

- Five designs with two variations of each plan for a total of 10 different units;
- Two types of products, front-loaded and rear loaded. Plan A and B with a ribbon driveway with turf instead of the traditional driveway;
- Eighteen Plan 18 A, B, and E units;
- All three-bedroom, three baths and two car garages;
- Living space for the A, B, and E units from 1,500 to 1,600 square feet;
- Twelve Plan C and D units with rear-loaded floor plan along Street B;
- Four units will face the park and eight units will face onto New Jersey Street;
- A three-foot decorative wall is proposed at the front property line;
- Porches on all units except for Plan D. Plan D-1 has no porch and Plan D-2 designed with a turret style entry;
- Plan E - front loaded units with a small backyard space.

Staff has provided recommended modifications that cover several issues. They include:

- Addition of windows and other elements to the elevations to ensure four-sided architecture.
- Variation of porch styles
- Additional design amenities to the garage doors and;
- Issues with design as related to the mailbox kiosk.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the public comment period at 9:50 p.m.



Mr. John D. Shumway, The Concord Group, 130 Newport Center Drive, Newport Beach CA stated that he supported the zone change from commercial to residential. He explained that his firm was asked to look at the site as a commercial property and it was determined that the site lacked the visibility and that traffic would most likely travel on California Street and Barton Road. He added that because the property was only 3.0 acres the site would not attract commercial development and possibilities would be limited.

Mary Lynn Cooke, 25340 Mead Street, informed the Commission that Doree Morgan had asked her to speak on her behalf because she had to leave. Ms. Cooke presented Ms. Morgan's comments stating that the project had not been approved at the Historical Commission and that Ms. Morgan opposed the project. Ms. Cooke added that Ms. Morgan would provide her comments in writing.

Roger P. Porter, 3837 E. 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Long Beach, CA, co-developer with Terry Smith and architect on the project stated that he had reviewed staff's recommendations and was ready to work with staff to make the project work.

Terry Smith, 18627 Brookhurst Street, Fountain Valley, CA, stated that this project would be his third project in Loma Linda bringing the total number of houses built to 56 homes mostly attached units. He commented that those projects fitted the needs of the targeted segment of the community, doctors, nurses, students, retirees, teachers and business owners who were interested in this type of product.

Hugo Chinchay, 26382 Antonio Circle, Loma Linda wanted to clarify the statements contained in letters he had received from the surrounding churches indicating their interest in having the project done. He continued to say that he had a list of clients, all professionals, which included students, doctors, nurses, etc, exceeded the proposed number of houses to be built.

Mary L. Cooke, 25340 Mead Street, Loma Linda, commented on the following:

- The feasibility study by Mr. Shumway of the Concord Group, stating that there was a lack of visibility for commercial uses at the present time but that might change in the future because of plans to redirect Mission Road to Orange Street would make Orange Street the gateway to the Mission Historical Overlay District.
- The Spanos project at the west end of the street would provide some visibility from the apartment residents and stated that she doubted that the other parcel that The Spanos Group had sold as commercial would be able to develop any time soon.
- She suggested that the designation for that area be changed to Administrative and Office in light of the possible surgical hospital project proposed at Barton Road and Nevada Street.

Jay Gallant, 26284 Cresthaven Court, Loma Linda commented that Loma Linda had a need for commercial development and stated that the designation should remain as commercial.

Chair Rosenbaum closed the public comment period at 10:14 p.m.

Commissioner Christianson commented that he could not support the project because of issues of density, traffic and the Historic Mission Overlay District and stated that the zoning should not be changed. He added that the Historical Commission had not given the project its approval and that he was supportive of their decision.

Vice Chair Neff commented that he supported a residential use for the area especially because of the presence of the churches. He continued to state that he was a proponent of the higher density because of the property's location and the great need for affordable housing for young professionals. Mr. Neff reminded the Commission that the discussions at the Draft General Plan public hearings were not finished and a decision on the future designation of the area had not been taken.

Chair Rosenbaum asked if the Planning Commission was not bound to make a decision on the project regardless of the discussion regarding Draft General Plan. Mr. Holdaway commented that with regards to applications that come before the Planning Commission, the Commission might take an action that would be consistent with the existing General Plan or amend the General Plan as proposed to bring it into conformity with the amended General Plan.

Commission Sakala commented that there was no guarantee that if these houses were built that the purchasers would be from Loma Linda or work in Loma Linda. She stated that she supported keeping the commercial designation for the property.

Commercial Umeda stated that it was difficult to decide what was appropriate for the property because a residential development would be isolated with no connection to any other residential neighborhood. He added that he was concerned about changing the zoning to residential from commercial based on the proposal and would not support residential development. He agreed with Commissioner Neff regarding the fact that no policy decision had yet to be made in regards to the General Plan.

Commissioner Neff clarified that he was not opposed to the change to the residential zoning but his suggestion was to wait until a decision regarding the zoning for the area at the Draft General Plan discussion at the October 20, 2004 meeting.

**Motion by Christianson, seconded by Umeda, and unanimously approved to continue Item E. 3 General Plan Amendment (GPA) NO. 04-03, Zone Change (ZC) NO. 04-03, Tentative Tract Map (TTM) NO. 16811, and Precise Plan Of Design (PPD) NO. 04-04 and a Development Agreement to a Special Meeting on November 17, 2004.**

Commissioner Sakala and Vice Chair Neff were appointed to work the applicant and make changes that would reflect any policy decision that would be made at the October 20, 2004 meeting.

A discussion ensued which resulted in Item E.2 – General Plan Amendment (GPA) No. 03-002, Zone Change (ZC) No. 03-002, Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 15738, Precise Plan Of Design (PPD) No. 04-08 and a Development Agreement being reopened.

**Motion by Sakala, seconded by Umeda, and unanimously carried to reconsider prior action for Item E.2, General Plan Amendment (GPA) No. 03-002, Zone Change (ZC) No. 03-002, Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 15738, Precise Plan Of Design (PPD) No. 04-08 and a Development Agreement.**

**Motion by Umeda, seconded by Neff, and carried by a vote of 4-0, Commissioner Christianson having recused himself, to continue General Plan Amendment (GPA) No. 03-002, Zone Change (ZC) No. 03-002, Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 15738, Precise Plan Of Design (PPD) No. 04-08 and a Development Agreement to a Special meeting on October 27, 2004.**

Staff was directed to re-notice the public hearing for this item.

**PC-04-53 - APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Minutes of the Adjourned Regular meeting of May 19, 2004.**

**Motion by Christianson, seconded by Neff, and unanimously carried to approve the Minutes Adjourned Regular meeting of May 19, 2004, as presented by staff.**

**REPORTS BY THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS**

No reports were given.

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT**

Director Woldruff reported that the General Plan Update would be presented on October 12, 2004 in a workshop setting. She added that a new General Plan Update schedule was being prepared to allow the approval of the new General Plan by year's end.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion by Christianson, seconded by Umeda, and unanimously carried to adjourn to a special meeting on October 20, 2004.**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:50 p.m.

Minutes approved at the regular meeting of March 16, 2005.

---

Administrative Secretary